

RECORDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
City Clerk's Conference Room, 1st Floor, City Hall
400 Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada
CITY OF LAS VEGAS INTERNET ADDRESS: <http://www.ci.las-vegas.nv.us>

June 14, 2002
1:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER: City Clerk Ronemus called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

ATTENDANCE: Barbara Jo (Roni) Ronemus, City Clerk
Doug Selby, Acting City Manager
John Redlein, Assistant City Attorney (arrived 2:00 p.m.)
Mark Vincent, Director, Finance & Business Services (excused 2:10 p.m.)
Joseph Marcella, Director, Information Technologies (excused 3:00 p.m.)
Richard Goecke, Director, Public Works
Radford Snelding, City Auditor (excused 3:00 p.m.)
Sharon Kuhns, Records Administrator
Donna Willey, Administrative Secretary

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE RE COMPLIANCE WITH THE OPEN MEETING LAW - Meeting noticed and posted at the following locations:

Las Vegas-Clark County Library District, 833 N. Las Vegas Boulevard
Senior Citizens Center, 450 E. Bonanza Road
Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy
Court Clerk's Bulletin Board, City Hall Plaza
City Hall Plaza, Posting Bulletin Board

(1:35)
1-1

BUSINESS:

A. APPROVAL OF FINAL MINUTES BY REFERENCE OF THE RECORDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 22, 2002

GOECKE - Motion to APPROVE – MARCELLA seconded the motion – UNANIMOUS

(1:35 – 1:36)
1-20

B. REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON RECORDS DESTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION FORM USED BY CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

Chair Ronemus reported that while attending the International Institute of Municipal Clerks, she was given a tour of the new records facility in San Antonio. She brought back blank copies of the form that they use. The City Attorney and the Records Facility Manager signs the form and on the back is space for a notary. Their Records Administrator advised that their authorization process for the destruction of records saved them from a six million dollar lawsuit and they are pleased with the result.

There has been much discussion with this Committee regarding the City's Interim Destruction Procedures and it was decided that the department director not sign off. Now that there is a destruction procedure and records are being destroyed, the Committee needs to look at a stronger authorization process. Chair Ronemus stated that she feels it's necessary to have the approval of the director.

Mr. Goecke stated that he is not in favor of the director sign off. Chair Ronemus replied that the director of the department would be responsible, not the records delegate or the administrator, if a record is destroyed in error. Therefore, it would be in the director's best interest to sign off in order to have knowledge of what is being destroyed. The director would know if there is litigation pending or if a record is the subject of a request. The staff member may not have that knowledge.

Mr. Vincent does not have a problem authorizing destruction, but he would rely on the records delegate for information. Ms. Kuhns advised the Committee that it was decided at the last Records Management Committee meeting that it is the responsibility of the City Attorney's office and the City Auditor to make known to the directors if there is a pending issue. Mr. Vincent stated that if he received notification from the Attorney, he would immediately forward a copy to his records delegate.

Chair Ronemus wants this item on the next agenda for further discussion. A draft will be put together to present to the City Manager.

Chair Ronemus thanked the Committee for their guidance.

(1:36 – 1:44)

C. REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON REVISIONS TO THE OPR (OFFICE OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY) RECORD SERIES AND CHAPTER 1 OF THE RECORDS MANAGEMENT HANDBOOK

Ms. Kuhns advised the Committee that she wrote an introduction in draft form that can be found in their backup documentation. The OPR list is in alphabetical order by records series because that's how the records delegate would look for it. Ms. Kuhns stated that due to the fact that Mr. Vincent was unable to attend the last Records Management Committee meeting, discussion regarding agreements, leases, and memorandums of understanding did not take place. Ms. Kuhns explained to the Committee that regarding these types of documents; the signature authority determines the OPR. The delegates are dealing with these documents at the end of the cycle and they will know who the OPR is by the signature that is on the document.

Mr. Vincent advised that regarding the Professional Services Agreement audit; the matrix presented at Team Las Vegas indicated that all agreements would find their way to Purchasing. In addition to having them on file, on a cyclical basis, they would be reviewed for compliance. Ms. Kuhns asked for clarification on whether she has to add a records series for Professional Services Agreements and make the Purchasing and Contracts division the OPR. Mr. Vincent stated the signature authority determining the OPR should be revisited. He also stated that Mr. Sylvain, City Attorney's Office, is rewriting Resolution R-145-2001 that authorizes management other than the Mayor to sign documents. The intent was to take advantage of the Bill that passed in 2001 that allows the Mayor to delegate, but it was miswritten. Chair Ronemus expressed her pleasure regarding the rewrite of the resolution due to the difficulties it has created in the document processing procedure in the Clerk's office.

Mr. Marcella suggested that the OPR should be based on the records series. He stated that from a retrieval perspective, how would the requestor know who signed it to get to the OPR. Ms. Kuhns replied that there would be a reference. Chair Ronemus thinks that all contracts and agreements should be maintained in the Clerk's office but she doesn't have a staff person who could devote that much time. Mr. Vincent stated that he does not have a problem with Purchasing and Contracts being the gatekeeper for the documents that go through Finance. Chair Ronemus stated that the OPR list would not be finalized until this issue is resolved. *She also directed Ms. Kuhns to circulate the OPR list to all directors for their input.* Acting City Manager Selby asked Mr. Goecke where the architect, engineer and construction contractor contracts are kept. Mr. Goecke stated that some are on file and some are in OAS. Acting City Manager Selby stated that the easiest way to sort them is by who signed them. It suggests that that's the originating department. He also stated that he likes the idea of centralizing it, but it may not be practical.

Chair Ronemus inquired about CMIR's (City Manager Information Reports) and whether they need to be retained at the department level since the Manager's office is the OPR. Acting City Manager Selby stated that there is no reason to keep them if the Manager's office has the original. Ms. Kuhns advised the Committee that the City Manager's retention period is still being negotiated as is duplicates at the department level. Ms. Kuhns advised Acting City Manager Selby that the Clerk's office has scanned all CMIR's into a database.

Ms. Kuhns explained the difficulty with contracts and contract modifications. The City Clerk maintains them if they are approved and executed by the City Manager, but contract modifications go through that never reach the Clerk's office. Therefore, the contract on file is incomplete because the modification is not filed with it. Acting City Manager Selby expressed his concern about change orders not being associated with the original document. Assistant City Attorney Redlein and Mr. Snelding concur that this issue is a problem. Ms. Kuhns advised Chair Ronemus that the retention on contracts is six years after completion of all extensions or modifications. Chair Ronemus noted that as long as there was a dollar amount, it was easy to tell where the contract belonged, but now it is very confusing with different signatories; the result of R-145-2001.

Acting City Manager Selby stated that with the volume of documents and plans in Public Works, it would be a difficult task if they needed to be moved to Purchasing and Contracts. Ms. Kuhns advised that Public Works functions under a different section of the NRS. Mr. Goecke stated that working under another provision has nothing to do with retaining records. He explained that whether or not he is the official keeper of the file or not, his department is where the most complete file can be found.

Mr. Snelding stated that documents retained in Finance or in Public works are not the problem. The problems are the documents that are exceptions. Mr. Marcella suggested there be a central location for the exceptions. The Committee concurred. *Chair Ronemus directed Ms. Kuhns to put the list together for suggested retention for department duplicates by department.* Ms. Kuhns stated that the list is supposed to be a general reference for copies of documents that will be in other departments. Listing them by department will not necessarily mean that all of signatures from Public Works will be recognized. Chair Ronemus explained that the type of document would be the determining factor, not the signatures. *Ms. Kuhns and Mr. Vincent will meet to discuss the OPR list and this item will be on the next agenda.*

Mr. Marcella asked Ms. Kuhns what the chances are for all of the Records Delegates to be consistent with the maintenance of the documents that are exceptions. Ms. Kuhns stated that they would need at least eighteen months of exposure and training. Mr. Marcella feels that with only four or five locations for documents, the process would work. Electronic documents will be more difficult to manage than paper. Central administration of the exceptions seems to be the most logical decision.

(1:44 – 2:42)

1 – 274

D. REPORT AND DISCUSSION CONCERNING RECORDS STORAGE FACILITY SURVEY RESULTS

Ms. Kuhns advised the Committee that Chair Ronemus distributed the initial survey, via e-mail, May 8, 2002. Four departments are outstanding. Commercial lease and areas throughout the City combined, total 7,597 square feet. Total boxes in storage are 3,114. Some departments will be relocating to the new section of City Hall and are doing active reorganization and clean out. Microfilm, maps and potential archival materials were addressed in addition to boxed records. One-on-one interviews with each department will be necessary to determine what records exist. This survey is for a proposed consolidated citywide records storage facility. Mr. Marcella stated that the square footage versus what is being paid for storage, not taken into consideration square footage in the building that is not being paid for, the cost would be \$20,722.50 per month for a facility versus \$12,480.00 that has been identified. With administration costs, traveling to sites, etc., a storage facility may be cost justified.

Chair Ronemus stated that the City should be able to use the storage facility for other purposes such as an IT room at 1,500 square feet that can be used for a training room. Climate control is an issue because of microfilm. The building is not fancy, just solid block wall with fire suppression over the top. It has the capability for mezzanine racking. It can have a separate roll-up door for Leisure Services that can be accessed 24 hours a day. A lot of office space is not necessary but there is a possibility for a scan center and election personnel. Also, there's consideration for a vault that can be used to store election materials that, by law, must be kept for 22 months. Some departments are not interested in the facility because they are happy with the outside vendors that they are using.

Ms. Kuhns reiterated that the survey is incomplete, a work in progress. *Acting City Manager Selby requested that it be defined as far as area, style and cost.* Ms. Kuhns will also revisit retention schedules as some departments are keeping records too long. She stated that she would assign records series numbers to the schedules, as they will be needed in the electronic document inventory system.

(2:42 – 3:00)

1-2533

E. REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON THE "BEST FILING PRACTICES" TRAINING AND "FILE FOOTNOTES" E-NEWSLETTER

Chair Ronemus advised the Committee of the E-newsletter, *File Footnotes*, that Ms. Kuhns prepared for the records delegates. She commended Ms. Kuhns for her work in this endeavor.

Diane Gladwell gave a presentation, Best Filing Practices, on the basics of filing and it was well received. There were requests from some departments for her to look at their records to determine what was needed. Ms. Kuhns advised Acting City Manager Selby that 68 employees attended the sessions.

(3:00 – 3:05)

1-3590

F. INFORMATIONAL MATTERS FOR FUTURE RECORDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AGENDAS

None.

(3:05)

2-65

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION:

None.

ADJOURNED:

REDLEIN - Motion to ADJOURN – SELBY - seconded the motion – UNANIMOUS

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

/dw